UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,265	12/14/2001	GopalaKrishna Reddy Kakivaya	MSFT-0736/183220.01	6084

41505	7590	01/19/2006		

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-27 and 29-41* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-27 and 29-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed on

October 27, 2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   Claims 1-13, 15-27 and 29-41 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 15, 16, 29

and 30 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 1-41 as being anticipated or unpatentable by

Ankireddipally et al. (U.S. Patent 6772216; date of patent August 3, 2004; filed May 19,

2000) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   The rejections of claims 1-13, 15-27 and 29-41 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been

withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1, 13, 15, 16, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification</u>, 17 January 2000, Copyright Harmonia, Inc., Language Version 2.0a, herein referred to as UIML.

Regarding independent claim 1, UIML discloses a method for describing a service of a device or object in a computing system, wherein the method is implemented by at least one processor of the computing system, comprising:

- describing the service with an extensible markup language (XML)-based Interface Description Language (IDL) that one to one maps each type of a particular type-based system to an XML schema and vice versa (p.4, 1, para. 1, 1.1, para. 1; p.6, para. 2; p.9, 3.1, para. 1; p.13, para. 1; p.14-15, code; p.40, 7, para. 2; p.46, para. 1-3 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a dictionary service is described using XML-based UIML which maps the system to XML).

Regarding independent claims 13, 15, 16, 29 and 30, the claims reflect the computer readable medium and computing device with means for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 2-7, 17-22, 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over UIML in view of Lucas et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030070158; publication

date April 10, 2003; filed February 22, 2002; provisional application filed July 2, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 2, 17 and 31, UIML discloses UIML is compliant with

XML (p.4, 1.1, para. 1) but does not disclose the XML-based IDL is Type Description

Language (TDL). Lucas teaches XML as a Type Description Language (p.5, para. 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

UIML and Lucas before him at the time the invention was made, to modify UIML taught

by UIML to include TDL as taught by Lucas, because XML is taught by Lucas as a Type

Description Language (p.5, para. 43) and UIML teaches UIML is XML compliant (p.4,

1.1, para. 1).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 18 and 32, UIML discloses a one to one mapping

from a programming construct to an XML schema for describing the programming

construct (p.13, para. 1; p.14-15, code – as demonstrated in the cited text, a programming construct for a dictionary service is mapped to XML).

Regarding dependent claims 4, 19 and 33, UIML discloses the programming construct is one of a pointer programming construct, primitive type programming construct, struct programming construct, class programming construct, array programming construct, subtype programming construct, enumeration type programming construct, service reference construct or bit field programming construct (p.14-15, code – as demonstrated in the cited text, the programming construct is a class programming construct).

Regarding dependent claims 5, 20 and 34, UIML discloses a one to one mapping from a constant value of complex type to an XML schema for describing the constant value of complex type and vice versa (p.14-15, code – as demonstrated in the cited text, the mapping is from a constant value to XML).

Regarding dependent claims 6, 21 and 35, UIML discloses a one to one mapping from at least one of properties, methods and events of the type system to an XML schema for describing the at least one of properties, methods and events (p.14-15, code – as demonstrated in the cited text, the mapping is from a property to XML).

Regarding dependent claims 7, 22 and 36, UIML discloses TDL supports inheritance

of programming constructs (p.53, 8.3, para. 1 – as demonstrated in the cited text,

inheritance is supported).

7.   Claims 8, 9, 23, 24, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over UIML in view of Randle et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030212904;

publication date November 13, 2003; filed June 11, 2003; continuation filed May 25,

2000).

Regarding dependent claims 8, 23 and 37, UIML does not disclose the XML-based

IDL is the wire format for message communications relating to the service between

devices of the computing system. Randle teaches wire format for message

communications (p.6, para. 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art, having the teachings of UIML and Randle before him at the time the invention

was made, to modify UIML taught by UIML to include wire format for communications as

taught by Randle, because using wire formats for communications, as taught by Randle

(p.6, para. 59) would have allowed more users to utilize the invention since there was a

familiarity with that format.

Regarding dependent claims 9, 24 and 38, UIML does not disclose the XML-based

IDL enables a one to one mapping from the wire format to the message

communications and vice versa. Randle teaches mapping from the wire format to the

communications (p.4, para. 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art, having the teachings of UIML and Randle before him at the time the invention

was made, to modify UIML taught by UIML to include mapping between wire format and

communications as taught by Randle, because mapping from the wire format, as taught

by Randle (p.4, para. 45), would have allowed more users to utilize the invention since

there was a familiarity with that format.

8.   Claims 10, 25 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over UIML in view of Lucas in further view of Randle.

Regarding dependent claims 10, 25 and 39, UIML does not disclose TDL enables the

transfer of a service reference across an application boundary. Randle teaches the

transfer across applications (p.2, para. 13). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of UIML and Randle before him at the time

the invention was made, to modify UIML taught by UIML to include transferring across

applications as taught by Randle, because transferring across applications, as taught by

Randle (p.2, para. 13), would allow the invention to be utilized in multiple settings which

would enhance usability and would allow a broader range of users access to the

invention.

9.   Claims 11, 26 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over UIML in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Pub. No. 20030058277; publication date

March 27, 2003; filed August 31, 1999).

Regarding dependent claims 11, 26 and 40, UIML does not disclose the computing

system is peer to peer distributed computing environment. Bowman-Amuah teaches

peer to peer computing (p.59, para. 1806). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of UIML and Bowman-Amuah before him at

the time the invention was made, to modify the computing system taught by UIML to

include peer to peer computing as taught by Bowman-Amuah, because peer to peer

computing, as taught by Bowman-Amuah (p.59, para. 1806), would allow multiple users

to simultaneously work on the same material which would enhance the invention since

materials would be shared during usage.

10.   Claims 12, 27 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over UIML in view of Berger et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20040093344; publication date May

13, 2004; filed August 8, 2003; continuation filed May 25, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 12, 27 and 41, UIML discloses UIML as extendable (p.9,

3.1.2, para. 1) but does not disclose the XML-based IDL is extendable to map additional

constructs of a richer type system to an XML schema and vice versa. Berger teaches

XML extended to richer types (p.11, para. 196). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of UIML and Berger before him at the time

the invention was made, to modify UIML taught by UIML to include extending to other

types as taught by Berger, because extending XML to richer types, as taught by Berger

(p.11, para. 196), would allow users with various skill levels to utilize the invention since

the language would be extendable to more complex types.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments filed on October 27, 2005 with respect to amended claims

1-13, 15-27, 29-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Systems and methods for transmitting motion control data (U.S. Pub. No. 20020156872),

- Customizable element management system and method using element modeling and protocol adapters (U.S. Pub. No. 20030101251),

- Brokering semantics between web services (U.S. Pub. No. 20030163450).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER